REMARKS

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

According to the Final Office Action, claims 22, 23, 28, 30-32, 37, 42-44 and 46-50 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,788,740 (van der Schaar) in view of U.S. Patent 6,804,827 (Furukawa), further in view of U.S. Patent 6,536,043 (Guedalia) and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,051,357 (Carr). Further according to the Final Office Action, claim 45 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over van der Schaar in view of Furukawa, further in view of Guedalia, further in view of Carr, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,470,378 (Tracton). Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 29, 38 and 49 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over van der Schaar in view of Furukawa, further in view of Guedalia, further in view of Carr, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,986,158 (Terui). Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 39-41 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Tracton in view Quick Time Showcase. Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 51-55 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over van der Schaar in view of Furukawa, further in view of Guedalia, further in view of Carr, and further in view of Quick Time Showcase.

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed as lacking sufficient factual support and failing to sustain a legal principle of obviousness in accordance with the statutory law.

It is respectfully submitted that pursuant to 35 USC 103(c)(1),

> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Van der Schaar qualifies as prior art under section 102(e) of 35 USC. However, van der Schaar does not qualify as prior art under 35 USC 103 because it was owned by the same entity as the present application.

Without conceding any statements or waiving any arguments in the Final Office Action on whether van der Schaar substantively discloses limitations in Applicant's claims, Applicant's representative submits that the rejection of claims 22, 23, 28, 30-32 and 37, 38, 42-55 have been overcome at least by virtue of inapplicability of van der Schaar as the prior art reference under 35 USC 103 and can no longer be sustained. Applicant's representative respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claims 39-41 are canceled without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejection.

It is believed that this case is ready to be passed to allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

July 23, 2007

By /Larry Liberchuk/
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation
914-333-9602